



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,539	10/18/2004	Masahiro Nakanishi	0033-0956PUS1	2317
2292 7590 08/12/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER LAY, MICHELLE K				
ART UNIT 2628		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 08/12/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/511,539	NAKANISHI, MASAHIRO	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		MICHELLE K. LAY	2628	

All Participants:

(1) MICHELLE K. LAY.

(2) Catherine Voisinnet.

Date of Interview: 31 July 2008

Status of Application: Final

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Time: 1pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Kashiwagi (5,850,206)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Michelle K. Lay/
Examiner, Art Unit 2628

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner requested interview due to inheriting the case from previous examiner (Almus Jankis). No record was found for the reasons why previous examiner agreed to withdraw finality (09/27/2007). Applicant reiterated that the primary reference (Kashiwagi) fails to teach a complexity means as recited in the independent claims and previous examiner had agreed. Also the grounds of the final office action (09/27/2007) was changed concerning NON-amended claims. Further, limitations of new and amended claims (06/11/2007) were not addressed. Current examiner has agreed to withdraw finality and issue a new non-final office action after further search and consideration.